Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/637,223	LIU, ZICHENG
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sheela C. Chawan	2624
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) Sheela C. Chawan.	(3) <u>Mrs. Katrina A. Lyon (Reg # 42,821)</u> .	
(2)	(4)	
Date of Interview: 27 February 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: Claim 10.		
Prior art documents discussed:		
N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE Amdt specification by adding object to be modeled in an anima		S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a writh record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance interview, since the interview
	•	
Sheel Charan 3/2/07		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

06 for mental of some of the sold of the s

PATENT APPLICATION
MS No. 303631.01
Attorney Docket No. MCS-036-03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Liu

Entitled: A SYSTEM AND METHOD

FOR MODELING THREE

DIMENSIONAL OBJECTS FROM A

SINGLE IMAGE

Serial No.: 10/637,223

Filing Date: August 8, 2003

Group Art Unit: 2624

Examiner: Chawan, Sheela C.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY/PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Hon. Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the telephonic interview between Examiner Chawan and Katrina Lyon of February 27, 2007 the applicants provide this proposed amendment to the specification to place the above-identified application in condition for allowance.

IN THE SPECIFICATION

Please amend the specification, on page 12, starting at line 13, as follows:

"In the most general sense, a single image of an object is input into the system and method according to the invention and a three-dimensional (3D) mesh with the texture of the original image is output. An overall flow diagram of the 3D modeling system and method is shown in FIG. 2. As shown in FIG. 2, process action 202, an image of an object is input into the system and method according to the invention. An object detector is used to find the object to be modeled in the image, as shown in process action 204. Then the features of the object are determined (process action 206). If the feature determination process action shows that the object is rotated out of the plane of the image, the amount of rotation is determined (process action 208), and this information is used to rotate the model to match the input image. The features of the object to be modeled are then used to align the feature points of the object in the image to a generic model of the object (process action 210). Once the generic model is so tailored to match the object in the image, the texture of the original image is applied (process action 212). The tailored model can be used for various applications. For example, in one embodiment the object to be modeled in an animal."

REMARKS

The application has been amended to put it in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action of November 1, 2006, Claims 10, 16, 20 and 21 were held to be allowable if amended to include the limitations of the claims from which it depends. In the Amendment of January 30, 2007, the allowable subject matter of Claim 10 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 1.

In a telephonic interview between Examiner Chawan and Katrina Lyon on February 27, 2007, the Examiner stated that the subject matter for Claim 10 did not appear to be supported in the specification. The applicants believe that Claim 10 is supported by FIG. 2 and the associated text describing it. However, since Claim 10 is an original claim, and the object being modeled being an animal is not specifically called out in the specification, the applicants are proposing amending the specification in order to specifically call out this subject matter in the specification.

This amendment is not new matter. Per the MPEP, Section 608.01,

"In establishing a disclosure, applicant may rely not only on the description and drawing as filed but also on the original claims if their content justifies it.

Where subject matter not shown in the drawing or described in the description is claimed in the application as filed, and such original claim itself constitutes a clear disclosure of this subject matter, then the claim should be treated on its merits, and requirement made to amend the drawing and description to show this subject matter. The claim should not be attacked either by objection or rejection because this subject matter is lacking in the drawing and description. It is the drawing and description that are defective, not the claim."

It is believed that specification, as well as Claims 2-7, 10, 11, 13, 16-18 and 21 and 22 are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (805) 278-8855 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Katrina A. Lyon

Registration No. 42,821
Attorney for Applicants

LYON & HARR, LLP 300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800 Oxnard, CA 93036 (805) 278-8855